

**communist party of israel
central committee·tel aviv**

July 1967

P.O.B. 1843

IN THE ISSUE :

S.M I K U N I S - A PEACE WITHOUT DICTATES
AND WITHOUT SURRENDER ■ M. S N E H - FROM
VICTORY IN THE WAR OF DEFENCE TO A STABLE
AND JUST PEACE ■ E. V I L E N S K A - A
DISAPPOINTING COMMUNIQUE OF THE WORLD
PEACE MOVEMENT ■

HX

632


A1

W9

No.1104

MAIN





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

C O N T E N T S

The 18th Plenary Session of the CC, CPI Resolution	4
From victory in the war of defence - to a stable and just peace - M. S N E H.	6
A peace without dictates and without surrender - S. M I K U N I S.	22
Mikunis condemns defamations of Israel's struggle for survival by new communist list.	25
Adisappointing communique of the world peace movement - E. V I L E N S K A.	27
The chinese threat	31

On June 23 - 24, 1967 the 18th Plenary Session of the CC of the CP of Israel took place. The members of the Central Control Commission took part as well.

In his opening speech, the chairman of the Session, comrade Shmuel Litvak, member of the Politbureau CC, CPI, stressed the heroism displayed by the soldiers of the Israeli Defense Army in the battle for the defense of Israel and paid tribute to those who had laid down their lives for it.

Comrade Moshe Sneh, member of the Politbureau and Secretary CC, CPI reported on the subject : From Victory in the War of Defense towards a just and lasting Peace. - 25 comrades participated in the debate that followed. Comrades S. Mikunis, General Secretary, and M. Sneh wound up the debate. The Central Committee endorsed the report and the closing remarks, and carried the following resolution :

RESOLUTION

1) The CC, CP of Israel declares that in the Six Days' War (June 5-10, 1967) the people of Israel fought in defence of its physical existence and for the existence of its State, against a Pan-Arabic Front, whose declared aim was the annihilation of Israel. In this struggle, no foreign forces whatsoever took part or cooperated. The Israeli Defense Army fought alone ; the mere existence, security and independence of the State of Israel were saved due to its glorious victory.

2) The CC endorses the activities of the Political Bureau, the Parliamentary faction and the Party Press, aimed at : safeguarding the defensive character of the military campaign; remaining truthful to its aim, namely - security and peace, and no annexations; stopping now, and preventing for the future any infringement of the rights, property and honour of the Arab population; for the rectification of any injustice committed to the population in the occupied territories, be it inadvertantly or intentionally.

3) The CC. CP of Israel expresses its regret over the one-sided position taken by the Soviet Union and the governments of some of the socialist countries. This position, on the one hand, disregards the plans for annihilation of Israel and the aggressive steps taken by the Arab states and - on the other hand - lays the responsibility for aggression solely and entirely on the State of Israel, while using hurtful insults, as for example comparison of Israel with Nazi Germany. - The CC, CPI wishes to hope that

this misrepresentation, which hits the people of Israel as a whole, will soon be overcome.

4) The CC considers it necessary for the State of Israel to initiate a Plan for Lasting Peace, a plan which will take into consideration the rights of the peoples concerned; and it proposes the following general lines of such a plan :

a) Self-Determination for the Palestinian Arab people in the occupied territories. The democratically and freely elected representation of the Arab people should enter into negotiations with the government of Israel over a peace treaty including final frontiers; rehabilitation of the refugees; mutual friendly relations in the economic and other fields, to be agreed.

b) Substitution of the cease-fire agreements with Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon by peace treaties based on the internationally recognised frontier lines which had existed prior to 1948. Freedom of navigation and free land-passage, mutually

c) A regional plan of common economic development, for use of the common waters for irrigation of the arid areas, for the production of electric energy, and the exploitation of the natural wealth of the region.

d) An international pact countersigned by the 4 Big Powers, concerning the neutralisation of the region, limitation of conventional armaments, denuclearisation, financial and technical assistance for regional development

5) The CC instructs the Political Bureau to bring these positions of the C. P. of Israel to the knowledge of the Israeli and of international public opinion - by means of printed and verbal explanatory activity, as well as by means of personal contacts with factors shaping public opinion and political bodies in Israel and abroad.

Lecture by Com. Moshe Sneh at the 18th Session of the CC. of the CPI

1) OUR ATTITUDE IN THE THREE STAGES OF THE CRISIS

In all the stages of the still prevailing crisis in the Israel-Arab relations, our Communist Party of Israel was guided in its way of political behaviour by two firm principles : a strong desire for peace between the peoples - and the solution of the conflict by way of an agreement that is to safeguard the just national rights of all the peoples concerned.

a) During the long period of increased military tension between the Arab countries and Israel, we acted in the spirit of the slogan: Everything for the prevention of War. Among the Israel public we fought - confronted with the rising tide of terrorist infiltrations into Israel territory against the system of military reprisals and forays into neighbouring territories, and for a truly defensive strategy of guarding our borders and territory by the best technical means, accompanied by a political offensive for a peaceful solution of the Israel - Arab conflict itself, based on mutual recognition of the legitimate rights of both parties. We resisted firmly the threat and use of force by any side whatsoever. We warned the government of Israel of the danger that imperialism might exploit every Israel-Arab clash for the purpose of its evil plans and intrigues. We approached influential fraternal parties, in the socialist countries as well as in the capitalist countries, we outlined to them the whole complex of the difficult Israel-Arab problem, and we advised them on the one hand, to exert their full influence on the Arab rulers to abandon the crazy idea of liquidating Israel, and on the other hand, to bring the government of Israel nearer to the socialist camp, steps that would untie its exclusive connection with the western powers, similar to the steps taken with regard to the rulers of Pakistan, Iran, Turkey, etc. We did not restrict our efforts to means of written and verbal explanation and propaganda only, but we maintained direct personal contacts with many public and governmental bodies in Israel and abroad, because we felt the danger of a military clash that we wished to prevent with our whole heart, our whole soul, by all our means.

With the increasing danger of war, after the sudden withdrawal of the U.N. Emergency Force from the Egyptian border with Israel, after the

concentration of armed forces on both sides of the border, and especially after the aggressive step of imposing a maritime blockade on the Israeli port of Eilat by the Egyptian armed forces in the Straits of Tiran, we intensified our activities to prevent war. We called on the government of Israel to take all the possible political measures against the aggressive actions on the part of neighbouring countries, and to abstain from military reaction. We called on the peace loving forces in the world to exert their influence on the two parties to the conflict and to demand that both, not only one of them, remove the obstacles from the way of preserving peace, i. e. gradual and mutual removal of the forces from both sides of the border; putting an end to the terrorist activities on the one hand, and to the reprisal attacks on the other; putting an end to the threats of "a war for the liberation of Palestine and the liquidation of Israel"; annulment of the blockade against Israel in the Red Sea. And when we saw that the situation was deteriorating towards a conflagration in the absence of coordination between the Big Powers and in the absence of results of the political efforts, we took the liberty to break the routine and to address to the appropriate bodies a proposal to convene an international conference to settle the problems of the Middle East, similar to the Geneva Conference of 1954 on the problems of South East Asia; if our words had found an attentive ear, the war might have been prevented.

b) When the fighting broke out, on the 5th of June 1967, our Party was faced by the problem how to evaluate this military campaign and what should be our attitude to it. We were guided by the well-known Leninist criterion, according to which the political aims of the parties are the decisive ones. While the pan-Arabic coalition of Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Iraq, supported by the other Arab states, set itself as a well-calculated, permanent and declared political and military aim the destruction of Israel, - this was for the people of Israel a campaign for the very existence, security and independence of the State of Israel. Consequently, the Central Committee decided on the same day unanimously, without any vote of opposition or abstention, that the C.P. of Israel stands together with the whole people in this fateful campaign.

The splendid victory of Israel's Defence Army, its soldiers and commanders, over the armies of Egypt, Jordan and Syria, and the conquest of territories from these three states - must not make us forget the danger to Israel's existence that was so terrible before this victory. I shall recall, for instance, the words of Ahmed Shukeiry, chairman of the "Palestine Liberation Organisation", who said on the 2nd of June 1967 - as reported from Amman to the "Morning Star" (organ of the Communist Party of Great Britain), that it is possible that the Jordanian or Palestinian army

will be the first to open fire and to "rush to the war for the liberation of the country"; and in reply to the question what would be the fate of the Israelis in case of Arab success, he added: "We shall help their transportation by ship to their countries of origin", while the Jews who were born in the country "every one of those who will remain alive will stay in Palestine, but in my own estimate, none of them will remain alive"....

Therefore, if Friedrich Engels was right in his letter to August Bebel (24. 10. 1891) that the German socialists must fight for the defence of Germany in view of the danger of war with Russia, "If Germany will be strangled, then we shall be strangled, too, together with her" (quoted from Lenin, fourth Russian edition, Vol. 12, p. 335) - it is evident that we, the Israeli Communists, were right, too, when we said: "If Israel will be strangled, then we shall be strangled, too, together with her" We are happy that in the Six Days' War the evil plan to strangle Israel was defeated.

The aim not to leave alive a single Israeli was not only the aim of the "Palestine Liberation Organisation" and its chairman, - this programme was confirmed and supported by the summit meetings of 13 kings and presidents of all Arab states, and only a few days before the outbreak of the fighting, the President of the U. A. R., Abdul Nasser, declared that the "final aim" of the "general confrontation" with Israel was "the liquidation of Israel". Even if we accept the interpretation given later by Abdul Nasser to his own words, that he intends to liquidate Israel politically and not physically, which means to impose on the Jewish people of the State of Israel a Palestine Arab rule, even if we accept this evasive and obscure interpretation, it is obvious that Israel's struggle against this "corrected" aim was a just war of defence according to Marxist-Leninist theory. That is what Lenin said: "The socialists recognised and still recognize now the legitimacy, the progressive character, the justification of defending the homeland or of a war of defence in the strict meaning of throwing off the oppressive yoke of another people" (Vol. 23, P. 19). Here was a war of defence of the Israeli homeland against the evil plan to impose on it the yoke of rule by another people, against the attempt to deprive the people of Israel of its national independence. In 1948, the Arab League started a war with the aim of liquidating the State of Israel on the day when it was born - and now, in 1967 this was again the aim of the war of the pan-Arabic coalition and consequently, this was, on the part of Israel, a continuation of the War of Independence of 1948.

Our attitude was courageous and independent. We did not hesitate to decide independently our attitude towards the military campaign, and in the beginning of the campaign to call on the Big Powers not to support:

one of them this side and the other one the other side, ~~to~~ to act together for an immediate cease-fire and for a peaceful solution for the benefit of both sides. Already in the period of the fierce fighting we publicly condemned every violation of the rights of the Arab civil population, we demanded to repair every injustice that had been committed, to take measures against any future violation of property, or rights or honour, and to punish the persons responsible for unlawful actions. Neither did we cease to remind the public during the fighting that the aim of our struggle was to achieve peace and not to conquer territories.

c) When the fighting ceased, at the end of the military campaign, we continued the same political line that we had taken before the fighting and during the fighting, i. e. the line of working for peace and for the solution of the Israel-Arab conflict by way of agreement and justice. All the years we maintained the right of self-determination for the two peoples of Palestine, Jews and Arabs; all the years we called for mutual recognition of the legitimate rights of both peoples; all the years we especially emphasised the moral and political duty to solve positively and by agreement the problem of the Palestine Arab refugees. Now, a practical possibility has been created to implement all these principles, to turn them from fine slogans into a fine reality. That is why we hurried to outline publicly, in the press and in the Knesset, the general features of the programme for peace - a peace without the dictate of victors and without the surrender of defeated - and to present it as an alternative to the extremist nationalistic circles in Israel whose chief ideal is the annexation of territories, territorial expansion.

Just as the war is nothing but a continuation, by violent means of the policy conducted before the outbreak of the fighting, thus - Lenin points out - "peace is the continuation of the very same policy, taking into consideration the changes in the balance of forces between the opponents, that have been caused as a result of the actions of war" (Vol. 22 P. 152). Therefore, those class-forces in Israel's society, who before the war were looking at the Israel-Arab problem from positions of power want now to gain from the military victory additional positions of power - while we, and together with us all those in Israeli society who before the outbreak of war saw the solution of the problem in a mutual agreement between the peoples, are now striving to advance from the military victory towards a stable and just peace.

2. GENERAL OUTLINE OF A PROGRAMME FOR PEACE

From the juridical-international point of view, it is necessary to replace the armistice agreements of 1949 by peace treaties between the State of Israel and its four neighbours : Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon. However it must not be forgotten that the subject in dispute was the fate of Palestine (in Hebrew "Eretz Yisrael", in Arabic "Falastin") which the U.N. Assembly, on the 29th of November 1947, decided to divide into two states, Jewish, and Arab, linked by an economic union.

The U.N. decision was not implemented in full because of the attitude of the rulers of the Arab states and of the (Palestine) Arab Higher Committee, who claimed that the whole country belongs to the Arabs, and that the Jewish people has no right to any part of it. By virtue of this attitude claiming "it is all mine", the war for the liquidation of the State of Israel has been started twice - on the 15th of May 1948 and on the 5th of June 1967 - and twice it ended in defeat.

It must be admitted that the Palestine Arab people - the legitimate partner in the country situated between the Jordan and the Mediterranean - never arrived at a free expression of its will. In 1947-49, when the problem was discussed by the U.N. institutions, this people was represented by the "Arab Higher Committee" headed by Amin El-Husseini, the former Mufti of Jerusalem, who arrived at Hitler's Chancellory as advisor on the liquidation of the Jews of Europe (his next-of-kin, Jamal Hussein, spoke on his behalf before the United Nations). The "Arab Higher Committee" was a self-appointed body that was never elected. During the armistice negotiations at Rhodes, none of the four Arab governments cared to safeguard the rights of the Palestine Arab people, and most of the territory destined to become its state was annexed by the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. In the last years, again, a body was set up that claimed to represent the Palestine Arab people, "The Palestine Liberation Organisation", by virtue of the approval given to it by the Arab Summit Conference of 1963, however its leadership was never elected, but appointed by a pro-fascist adventurer, Ahmed Shukeiry. All these usurpators of representative position demanded that the whole country be given to the Arabs of Palestine and achieved nothing for them; they only played a criminal game with their fate.

a) At present, the overwhelming majority of the Palestine Arab people lives in areas under Israeli authority. There are people who want to make use of this circumstance so as to annex completely the "Western Bank" and the "Ghaza Strip" to the State of Israel, and there are others

who want to "grant" the inhabitants of these territories autonomy within the State of Israel, while others want to impose on them a federation with the State of Israel. All these ideas are incompatible with the principle of self-determination, and therefore we cannot agree to any one of them. We - the Communist Party of Israel - regard this hour as suitable for an entirely different solution, namely the implementation of the principle of self-determination with regard to the Palestine Arab people living in the territories that have been conquered by Israel's Defence Army. It is our opinion that the Israeli authorities should approach the Arab population in these territories and propose to them to elect a democratic representation in free elections (supplying all necessary guarantees as to the freedom of election); this democratic representation should formulate its will with regard to the fate of its country (Arab Falastin) and should conduct negotiations with the representatives of the State of Israel, as equals with equals, on a peace treaty including : a permanent border between the two parts of the country, re-settlement of the refugees, friendly mutual relations in the spheres of economy, defence, etc., everything as to be agreed between the parties.

b) When the Palestine problem finds its solution by direct agreement between the two peoples concerned, the neighbouring Arab states will not have any pretext for bothering Israel, and we on our part will propose to Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Lebanon peace treaties based on the international borders from before 1948, based on freedom of navigation and freedom of mutual transition by land.

c) It is our opinion, that Israel should bring the neighbouring Arab peoples, simultaneously with a programme for peace, also a programme of joint regional economic development - for the exploitation of the river waters, for the irrigation of arid areas, for the output of electricity and of the natural resources. This joint regional development is necessary so as to create a new economic asset for the settlement of the refugees, it is necessary for raising the socio-economic level of the countries in the region, it is necessary as a bridge leading from relations of hostility and suspicion between the peoples to relations of cooperation and mutual trust, which are the basis of a permanent peace.

d) An Israel-Arab agreement and an agreement between the Big Powers are mutually interdependent. Therefore, simultaneously with our initiative for an agreement with the Arab peoples, Israel's policy must act for the promotion of an international agreement - with the cooperation of the four big powers - for the neutralisation of the region, for putting an end to the conventional armaments' race in the region, for

de-nuclearisation of the Middle East, for extending support to the regional development programme by providing money and technical aid.

We do not say that our programme must be accepted as it is. We hereby only present the general outline of a programme for peace. We shall willingly support any other idea serving the aim of stable and just peace.

We do not think that the Israeli initiative for a permanent peace should be postponed until another time. Such a postponement causes double damage : outside, abroad it stabilises the idea of Israel as a conqueror; and inside Israel, public opinion is getting used to regarding the occupied territories as a "rightful property".

The Prime Minister Levy Eshkol, in his answer to our Comrade Samuel Mikunis requested not to draw a difference between the "hawks" and the "doves" in the government circles. It seems that he did not pay attention that in the same session of the Knesset, there appeared a striking contradiction between his words and those of the Minister of Defence Moshe Dayan. Truly, Dayan resembles more a "hawk" than Eshkol a "dove" but we shall not underestimate the difference between their conception. While the Prime Minister is emphasising security and peace as the aim of our political struggle after the military campaign, it is evident that the Minister of Defence laid special stress on the validity of the territorial conquests.

It seems to us, that the line dividing the Israeli public and maybe the government circles, too, in the near future, will pass between the desire to exploit the military victory for a more convenient and more secure basis towards a future military confrontation, and the desire to turn the military victory into a lever for a fundamental change in the relations between the people, for raising the consciousness of the necessity of co-existence between the Arab peoples and Israel, for the promotion of peace to be founded on mutual agreement, on mutual recognition, on mutual respect for the rights of both peoples, for opening a new page in the history of this region. This does not mean that other lines of separation will disappear or lose their importance however up to the end of the political struggle that has started following the military campaign, this is the decisive dividing line. And our Party must be prepared for partnerships and for clashes on this decisive front.

The question is not only what is preferable - conquest or peace ? The question is also, what kind of peace - peace with one of the neigh-

bouring countries under the patronage of one of the Big Powers (the United States) or peace with all the neighbouring countries linked by an agreement between all the big powers. In this respect, too, our answer is clear and our vigilance is necessary.

The possible affiliation of the Rafi Party to Mapai and the possible affiliation of Mapam to the Alignment (Mapai-Ahdut-Ha'avoda) must increase our sense of responsibility and our concern as the Communist Party of Israel, with regard to the prospects of Israel-Arab peace and the cause of the working-class; this must increase the efforts of our struggle for the unification of the forces of left labour based on the foundations of national loyalty and class loyalty, against the trend of all-out unity under the hegemony of the right-wing of the working class.

3. OUR OBJECTIONS TO A ONE-SIDED APPROACH

To our deepest regret, the approach of the Soviet government to the military campaign between Israel and the Arab states is entirely different from our approach described above. The C.C. of the C.P.S.U. (in its resolution published in "Pravda" of the 21th of June, 1967), starts from the assumption that this was an "Israeli aggression", as a "result of a plot between the most reactionary forces of international imperialism", "against the advanced Arab countries that choose the way of progressive social-economic changes for the benefit of the toilers, and that are leading an anti-imperialist policy".

We think that there is no reason at all for accusing Israel of aggression. The General Secretary of the United Nations, U Thant, reported to the Security Council that it is impossible to determine which side has started the attack. The Commander of the U.N. Emergency Force on the Egyptian border with Israel, General Rikie of India, stated in his farewell speech, that "both sides have started simultaneously to attack each other." The operative orders which the Israel Army found in the staff headquarters of the Egyptian and Syrian brigades, are a striking proof of the prepared attack on Israel and of the timing of the attack for the 5th of June 1967. However, it is not decisive who shot the first shot - as we were taught by Lenin - but the political aim of the shooting. And the declared political aim of the Arab governments that got together for war against Israel, was the liquidation of Israel. It is possible of course, to keep silent in view of this criminal and incriminating plot. But keeping silent does not change the reality. The prolonged acts of sabotage and murder by infiltrators belonging to Arab terrorist organisations in Israeli territory - may be kept untold, but this does not make

the facts untrue. The Egyptian blockade in the Straits of Tiran may not be mentioned but not to mention it does not annul this aggressive step. It is possible to ignore such an important fact as the attitude adopted by Egypt and other Arab countries, that the state of belligerency between them and Israel continues and remains in force all these years, but this weighty fact does not disappear because somebody wants it to be forgotten. In short - the truth is that Israel has repelled and foiled an aggression that has threatened her very existence, did not start an aggression against her neighbours.

We have proved not once, that the alliance of the Arab states set up for the war against Israel, was not set up on the basis of anti-imperialism and progress for the benefit of the workers. What kind of anti-imperialism is that whose representatives are the Kings Hussein and Feisal ? And what kind of progress is that whose standard-bearer is Colonel Aref ? This is how the regime in Iraq was described by the representatives of the Iraqi Communist Party (at the 7th Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Berlin, April 1967) : "The government continues to fight Communism vigorously. Thousands of Communists and progressives are still held in prison and are suffering tortures of body and soul. Others are deprived of employment for political reasons. The present rulers of Iraq deprive the national forces of their freedom.... Several months ago, a strike of workers has been suppressed by force of arms. The chauvinistic rulers have done nothing to solve the problem of the Kurds. There is no sign of good will. They open the gates to foreign capital, and enable the supporters of the monarchy and its agents to seize important positions in the administration. The rulers of Iraq spread demagogical slogans about Arab solidarity, positive neutrality and struggle against imperialism. But in their policy they try to compromise with imperialism and reaction"... This authentic Communist view of what the regime in one of the countries that opened the war against Israel looks like together with the striking fact that the Defence Army of Israel has fought alone, without the support of the United States or another imperialistic power, is sufficient to deny the completely unfounded assumption identifying Israel with imperialism and the Arab countries with anti-imperialism. The common denominator of the front of war against Israel is not anti-imperialism but pan-Arabism. And if we compare the various kinds of regimes in the countries of our region, their standards of economic, social, scientific and technical development, their standard of democracy and the stages of organisation achieved by their working class, - Israel is not inferior in these respects to the others.

The Arab national movement which is generally anti-imperialistic,

is infected - like similar movements - with elements, signs and remnants of backwardness from the past, and among others, it is still suffering from extremist anti-Israeli chauvinism fostered by imperialistic intrigues for many years. In the whole world there is nothing like this attitude of the most advanced Arab governments refusing to accept the very existence of the State of Israel and the necessity of co-existence with this State. How is it possible to disregard this root of the evil ? This anti-Israeli Arab chauvinism objectively serves imperialism and invites its intervention not less than anti-Arab Israeli chauvinism. Therefore, a true correct and wise anti-imperialist policy in the Middle East calls for the annulment of the Israel-Arab conflict, to bring the two parties to mutual recognition of the other's rights, and to direct both to the way of peace, progress and liberation from dependence on the imperialistic powers.

We - our people, our Party - will not listen to the advice of various counsellors who tell us not believe that the threat of wiping out Israel is serious, because this is only a "verbal", a "propagandistic" threat. Nobody will succeed in lulling the vigilance of the Jewish people, that sacrificed in this generation 6 millions out of 10 millions of its brethren in Europe. Nobody will lull the vigilance of the remnants of our people who have gathered here, in this region, where other peoples in this generation have been slaughtered - Armenians, Assyrians, Kurds. Nobody will lull our vigilance in view of the many preparations for war staged in the last years with the intention of implementing this "verbal" and "propagandistic" slogan of wiping out Israel, such as the mobilisation and training of the Palestinians as an "Army of Liberation" that has been given the official recognition of 13 Arab states and declared and practical support by mighty People's China and not only by her; the establishment of the "United Arab Command" only for the war against Israel, because it had not and could not have another common aim (at the same time Egypt and Saudi Arabia fought against each other in the Yemen); the network of military alliance of Egypt with Syria, with Jordan, with Iraq, with distant Arab states...

We did not and will not accept the advice to underestimate the threats of wiping out Israel, but neither has been accepted our own advice to competent bodies, institutions, conventions and forces in the camp of world peace and socialism, that they openly and publicly, with energy and courage condemn the slogan of "liquidating Israel", and the international economic, political and social boycott against Israel, the treats of a "war for the liberation of Palestine" and the whole stupid and ill-bred conception of the Israel-Arab conflict as a conflict between colonialism and its victim. Many years we have warned that

all this leads to a war bearing grave dangers not only to the security of all the peoples of the region, but also to the process of political and social progress in this region.

Neither was our demand accepted that the world communist movement, the socialist states, the whole anti-imperialistic camp, adopt an attitude towards the Israel-Arab conflict similar to that they adopted towards similar conflicts, such as between China and India, between India and Pakistan, between Abyssinia and Somali, etc., namely not to support one side against the other, but to support a peaceful solution agreed between the parties to the dispute.

To our deepest regret, the Soviet government took a one-sided stand supporting the anti-Israeli Arab front, and for many years did not utter a single word of public dissatisfaction with the aggressive speeches and actions of the Arab rulers against Israel.

The one-sided approach to the very essence of the Israel-Arab conflict, disregarding facts of the existing reality, rehabilitating Arab reactionary anti-Israeli chauvinism and raising against Israel false accusations and slanders, found its continuation also with regard to the military campaign of the 5th to the 10th of June 1967, after the Soviet government sided with one of the fighting opponents, with the Arab side, with the alliance of Nasser-Attasi-Hussein-Aref, while for the Israeli side in the campaign it did not find another comparison but with Nazi Germany. The whole course of events that led to war and even the history of the establishment of the State of Israel 19 years ago were presented in a way absolutely contradicting the reality known to us. After the consultations in Moscow of the 9th of June 1967, that ended with a joint declaration of 7 socialist states, an attitude identical to that of the Soviet government was proclaimed by the leader of the Polish United Workers Party, W. Gomulka. In his speech (according to "Trybuna Ludu" of the 20th of June) he presents the campaign of June 1967 as a "third aggression" on the part of Israel, thus defining as aggression not only the Sinai War of 1956, but also the War of Independence of 1948/9. The same said A. Kossygin, too, at the UN Assembly (19th of June) defining the war of 1948/9 as an aggressive war of conquest on the part of Israel. The speech of Gomulka does not mention at all the support extended by People's Poland - besides the Soviet Union - to the war of Israel's independence, and he says: "The State of Israel has been born in the fire of war directed against the Palestinian Arabs and the Arab countries" - while we well remember the speeches of the Polish delegates at the U.N.O. who condemned the aggression of the Arab League the servant of imperialism.

Gomulka's speech also ignores the decisive argument raised by the Soviet and Polish delegates at the U.N.O. in favour of an independent state for the Jewish people, namely the argument of the Nazi holocaust and the duty to secure a homeland for the surviving refugees of the Jewish people. While, on the other hand, we find the following sentence: "Israel followed the example of the Hitlerite Wehrmacht, the militarists of Bonn are following now the example of the Israeli "Blitzkrieg". Next-of-kin always find each other"... We also find in Gomulka's speech stories of horror, according to which "the Israeli aggressors are deporting hundreds of thousands of additional Arabs from the territories of the Arab countries that were conquered by the Israeli army" - no more and no less than hundreds of thousands additional Arabs.... Gomulka's speech states with absolute certainty that the blockade in the Straits of Tiran never existed, and that the Arab states never thought of liquidating the State of Israel, - because all these tales are nothing but a "deception that has become a method of the Israeli government's policy" - but at the same time it is no wonder that there are "voices of Arabs who are driven from their land, demanding the liquidation of the State of Israel"... The speech of Gomulka recalls that the territory allocated in 1947 to the State of Israel is 14,000 square kilometres and in this area the Arab population was 45%. Finally, Gomulka comes with a warning to the Polish citizens who are supporting Israel: "We did not hinder the persons of Jewish nationality from going to Israel, but we cannot be indifferent towards persons who, while world peace is in danger, and consequently also the security of Poland are siding with the aggressor, with the enemies of peace, with imperialism"...

No wonder that the campaign of condemnations, insults and accusations against Israel rouses anti-Semitic feelings - as we learned, among others, from the speeches of the leaders of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party, G. Kalai and Z. Komoscin, who found it necessary to warn of this deplorable feature (Népszabadság, 15-16th of June).

It is not enough that we take note of these attitudes, this anti-Israeli campaign, it is not even enough that we reject all responsibility and connection with it - we must search for the roots of this injustice.

4. THE ROOTS OF THE INJUSTICE AND THE PROSPECTS OF ITS RECTIFICATION

It seems, that some competent factor has conceived the idea that pan-Arabic unity will give birth to the anti-imperialistic front in the Middle-East, and that the hatred of Israel is the only cement that is capable of holding Arab unity together. Needless to say, we absolutely

deny this ill-conceived idea. This idea belongs to the school of Mao Tse-Tung and it is incompatible with the whole method of thought of Marxism-Leninism. The pity is, that the same competent factor seems to believe that in the competition between Soviet influence and the Chinese influence in the Arab region it is permissible or perhaps even desirable to adopt the Chinese line and to imitate it. We absolutely reject this idea, too. We regard this approach as a kind of branch emanating from the more general and erroneous conception that caused the downfall of the regime of Kassem in Iraq, of Ben Bella in Algeria, of Nkruma in Ghana, of Soekarno in Indonesia, and so on. This is the conception of identification with the anti-imperialistic national movement instead of supporting only its progressive features and fighting against its regressive features, as Lenin taught us (Vol. 20, Page 18). This conception has suffered defeat in the very outbreak of the Six Days' War in June 1967, and, of course, also in its outcome.

And after the military campaign - what else ? Just as Israel, after her military victory, is facing the dilemma to prefer annexations or a peace treaty, Egypt and all the Arab states are faced with the fateful dilemma after their military defeat - to achieve a honourable peace with Israel or to prepare a war of revenge. There is no third choice. We expect, we request the Soviet Union, the whole world camp of peace and socialism, to exert their influence only in the direction of an Israel-Arab agreement for a stable and just peace. Any other policy on the part of our world camp will only lead to further defeats.

For us, Israel, it is not necessary at all that the countries of the world repeat and declare before us, that we have a right to exist, but it is necessary that all the states of the world declare this clearly and loudly before the Arab rulers, so that they may finally understand that they must sit down at the conference table with the representatives of the State of Israel. Unless this is done, how can peace be achieved ?

We have published the differences of the approach between us and many and mighty factors in our international camp. But we, the Communist Party of Israel, are not isolated at all. We must emphasise in particular the attitude of the Rumanian Communist Party and of the government of R. S. R., who after the Moscow consultation of the 9th of June 67 did not cut off her diplomatic relations with Israel and who conducts in the international arena not a one-sided policy, but a policy intended to bring the two parties nearer to negotiations on a peace treaty. We think that this is the principled policy led by our international camp in all similar conflicts, and there is no reason that this time should be an exception.

Therefore, we hope and recommend that other Socialist states and other Communist Parties, too, take the line adopted by the Rumanian comrades.

We receive declarations and communiqués of parties, youth organisations, organs, personalities and groups belonging to the world camp of peace and socialism, including peace committees and friendship associations with the Soviet Union from various countries, which conform in principle our approach and our attitude.

We are certain that we are right, we are convinced that the problems of our region are well known and well understood by us, that the solutions we formulate to these problems conform with the foundations of Marxism-Leninism, our socialist internationalism and our socialist patriotism alike. The fact that different kinds of approach have appeared between us and a number of important fraternal parties, is deplored by us, but this is no reason that we dispense with our truth. All Communist Parties are independent, have equal rights, and each party is certainly entitled to decide on the matters of its people and its country.

It maybe worthwhile to raise a certain analogy, which, like every analogy, includes differences and similarities alike. Upon the outbreak of the armed conflict between China and India, the Indian Communist Party (except for a faction split from the Party), sided with the Indian people against the Chinese Red Army - and up to this very day the Party (and not the faction split from it) is accepted and respected by the international movement. It is self-evident that the army of Jordan, Syria or Egypt, is no Red Army - while, on the other hand, the Chinese Army has not planned - as agreed by all - the destruction of India.

Therefore it is painful when a Communist newspaper in any country undertakes the task which is not its competence, to issue a verdict on matters that are fateful for us. For instance, "L'Humanité" of the 20th of June 1967 undertook to report to its readers that our programme regarding the Arab areas of the country that are held by the Defence Army of Israel is "a copy" of the version of Ben Gurion and Moshe Dayan.... It is very interesting that a bourgeois daily such as "Ha'aretz" draws a line of difference between our programme ("full and unlimited sovereignty") and the plans of Dayan and others (Federation or annexation). It is very interesting that a democratic Paris weekly such as "Expres" (19-25 June) knows the difference ("no coercion", "no reactionary character in alliance with King Hussein"); and only such a respectable Communist organ as "L'Humanité" did not know the difference, and took the liberty to deny a Leninist programme

me of recognition of the right of self-determination unto separation of a people subjected to the military rule of another people. We shall not argue; let us leave this job to the readers of "L'Humanité" who are sending to the editors a flood of letters criticising the attitude of the newspaper; we only express astonishment at this fierce desire to pass judgement on a matter that is in the competence of the Israeli Communists.

The definition of the character of a war (or of an armed conflict or of a military campaign) is one of the most complicated and hardest jobs. There were cases when a definition was given and changed. Even with regard to such a great war as the Second World War in its first stage (1st of Sept. 1939 - 22 June 1942) an authoritative international Communist definition was given that this was an imperialistic war on both sides and Communists are not interested in it on this or the other side. It is obvious, that the Communist Parties in the countries of the Nazi invasion and conquest could not stand this unfounded definition. Needless to say, that Thorez and Duclos signed the call to the French working class and people of the 10th of July 1940 to fight against the Hitlerite conqueror without mercy, and they did not wait until an international authority changed the definition of the war. Gomulka and his friends, too, established the P. P. R. in the underground war against the Nazis notwithstanding the competent (but criminal) resolution on the liquidation of the Polish Communist Party and notwithstanding the authoritative attitude on the character of the war. Only later came from far away the correction stating that the war had from the beginning a democratic and anti-fascist character, and the entry of the Soviet Union into the war only deepened this character.

We are convinced that with regard to the Israel-Arab conflict and mainly with regard to the last armed conflict, an injustice has been committed on the part of the government of the Soviet Union followed by errors made by other socialist governments and Communist parties. We are convinced that this injustice will be rectified just as were previous injustices in other matters. We are convinced that the communiqué of the Soviet Foreign Ministry of the 17th of April 1956, expressing the readiness of the U. S. S. R. to support, together with other factors in the U. N. O., the achievement of Israel-Arab peace by way of mutual agreement taking into account the legitimate rights of all peoples concerned, is valid up to this very day, and that this is the correct basis for a Soviet policy in our region.

We know very well how great are in these days the disappointment and the confusion in all left-wing groups, among the friends of the USSR, in all the Israeli public. In the name of the Communist Party of Israel we say to them : Do not identify a wrong and unjust, but temporary attitude -

with the Soviet Union as a general historical value, and certainly not with the ideology of Communism, with the world-wide historical significance of the Great Socialist October Revolution. And to those men directing Israeli policy we say and repeat : Be all the efforts directed to opening the bridge to the Soviet Union that has been closed before us unjustifiably, but beware of burning the bridge that we are so interested in renewing.

Our Israeli Communist Party faces a tough campaign on two fronts: Inside Israel we are fighting against the desire for territorial annexations, and inside the international communist camp we are fighting against the identification with anti-Israeli Arab chauvinism. In every one of these two campaigns we are fighting for peace and for justice for the two peoples, for our people and for the neighbouring people. And where there is peace and justice, there will be victory.

A PEACE WITHOUT DICTATES AND WITHOUT SURRENDER

Com. Samuel Mikunis, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Israel, brought on the 21st of June 1967 before the Knesset, in a motion to the agenda, the Programme for Peace, in which he outlined the principles of a peaceful solution of the Israel-Arab conflict.

The C. P. I. representative said, among others :

"We mean a just programme of peace, because only such a programme is apt to give us real peace and security. We mean an agreed programme of peace, without dictate and without surrender, based on the mutual recognition of the legitimate rights of both parties, because only such a programme is apt to render our country citizenship in this region as a recognised respected and sovereign state. We mean a programme of peace without coercion of one party toward the other, because only such a programme is apt to prevent foreign intervention for the benefit of foreign interests and to secure real independence for Israel as well as for the Arab countries. We mean turning the armistice agreements of 1949 into permanent peace treaties, whose starting point are not conquest and territorial annexations, but the safeguarding of peace and the safeguarding of our national existence and future, which was and has remained the fundamental objective of the military campaign that has been forced upon Israel".

S. Mikunis condemned the evil plans of annexations conceived by the Israeli right-wing and militarists and pointed out :

"The right-wing forces in Israel that regard additional territories as a guaranty for peace, those who turn by a mere few words the Western Bank into an Israeli colony that is to bear even the name of a "Palestinian State" those who express unbalanced considerations with regard to the occupied territories in the south and in the north - those, I think, knowingly disregard the political balance of forces in the region, the pressure of the Big Powers, world public opinion in general. Their obvious unwillingness to take a positive and responsible line of thinking, is, by the way, also the outcome of a drive for exclusive power in this country a drive they did not forget even in the fateful days when the whole people stood in the struggle for Israel's very existence. They did not contribute much to the military campaign, but their activities might cause much harm to

Israel's political campaign".

Unlike the right-wing forces, the Communist spokesman demanded a responsible approach - not to be affected by the drunkenness of victory
He added :

"We cannot build our life here on permanent war. We seriously take into consideration the regional and global reality in which Israel is situated, but above all we take into consideration the urgent need that the people of Israel say its own balanced word on the question of safeguarding peace.

The debate in the Knesset on the preparation of a programme for peace is vital and most urgent following the world-wide campaign of distortion with regard to the character and circumstances of the campaign, and also because it is necessary to give a serious answer of peace to the renewed declarations of the Presidents of Egypt and Syria on the continuation of the war and on their intention to renew the war, in fact, at a proper time. Allow me in this context, in addition to what has been said above on this matter, to outline several basic lines of an Israeli programme for peace, considering the new situation that has arisen after the ceasefire.

First of all, the new element in the situation is, that the whole territory of former Mandatory Palestine and the majority of the Palestine Arab people are under Israeli rule and the overwhelming majority of this people lives in the territories recently occupied by the Defense Army of Israel. This is an opportunity for a final and just settlement of the Palestine problem, for a settlement of the problem of refugees, for an Israel-Arab settlement based on the right of the Palestine Arab people to self-determination. This is an opportunity to help the Palestine Arab people to set up an independent Palestine Arab state, to help it to elect itself a national representative body by securing full conditions of free democratic elections. The authoritative national representative body will take care of establishing the institutions of the new state, and at the same time this body can enter negotiations with the State of Israel on a peace treaty, on the markation of permanent borders of peace between the Palestine Arab state and Israel, on the resettlement of the refugees, on an outlet to the sea on all the complex of problems and relations that will rise up between the two peoples of this country, between the two states".

S. Mikunis warned of the danger of a Pax Americana and added :

The proposed peaceful solution is apt to prevent imperialistic intervention. Such a solution will also remove the soil under the plans of a joint settlement with King Hussein, that are being nourished by the right-wing forces in our country. It will prevent a so-called "Pax Americana"; such a solution is apt, in the course of time and in the process of its implementation, to withdraw from intervention in the Israel-Arab problem not only imperialism but also the ruling cliques of the Arab countries, who have also played the card of the Palestine Arab people and who have used it for their own political aims, while bringing innumerable defeats upon the head of this people.

And with regard to Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Lebanon, it is reasonable that a peace treaty be signed between Israel and these countries, based on the international frontiers before 1948. This peace treaty must include, of course, the freedom of passage through the Red Sea and the Suez Canal, complete security on the borders, annulment of the economic boycott and the hostile propaganda, guaranteeing mutual passage by land. No doubt, with such a peaceful settlement, there will be no special difficulty to arrive also at a joint regional economic development project for the exploitation of the river-waters, for the irrigation of barren lands, production of electricity and of the natural resources. This will greatly help the resettlement of the Arab refugees on a fair standard, for the promotion of the economic and social interests of the peoples of the region.

Such solutions will open a wide road to international agreement, with the cooperation of the Big Powers, for neutralisation of the region, for putting an end to the costly conventional armaments race, for turning our region into a zone demilitarised of nuclear weapons, and even for financial and scientific-technical international aid to the development projects".

At the end of his speech, Com. Mikunis called for building bridges to the socialist camp. He said :

"Let us not omit to point out with satisfaction, that in his speech, at the U.N. Assembly, the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Kosygin found it proper to emphasize that the Soviet Union is not an opponent of Israel as a state and that she supported Israel in 1947 because of her adherence to the principle of the right of self-determination. A policy fostering the improvement of the relations with the Soviet Union in the past and in the future, was not and will not be a policy of illusions, but a clever foresight of prospects. This lesson can be learnt even from the blessed development of relations between Israel and the Rumanian Socialist Republic, which will not remain an isolated episode. In any case, the West-German "shelter on a rainy day" and the "unshakable" friendship with France advocated by S. Peres and Moshe Dayan and others have not stood the trial".

MIKUNIS CONDEMNS DEFAMATIONS OF ISRAEL'S STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL BY NEW COMMUNIST LIST

Taking advantage of the technical debate on the alteration of the name of an Israeli bonds' law, held in the Israeli parliament on July 4th, Meir Vilner representative of the New Communist List (NCL) faction, that split away from the Communist Party of Israel two years ago, came out with a defamation of Israel's struggle against annihilation and for her existence and sovereignty. He also took to deception, calling himself "representative of the Communist Party's faction in parliament".

In view of this, Samuel Mikunis M.P., the Secretary General of the Communist Party of Israel took the floor, in order to expose this deception and to put Israel's struggle for survival in the proper light.

Israel's public opinion received comrade Mikunis' speech with much attention and acclaimed it as an exemplary patriotic and internationalist conduct. The speech became the topic of the day among the masses, who read it in the newspapers and heard it over the radio.

S. Mikunis said :

"We are opposed to territorial annexations and to the perpetuation of territorial conquests, but the last war was forced upon us by the Arab rulers, who pursued the political aim of Israel's annihilation. The aim of the people of Israel in this battle was, and still is, the achievement of a just and stable peace with the Arab countries."

The CPI representative went on :

"The Knesset member Vilner did not speak on behalf of the Communist faction as claimed by him. I request the Speaker to put the members of the House in their place whenever they miscall the name of their faction. I do speak on behalf of the parliamentary faction of the Communist Party of Israel.

"There has been proposed here a technical alteration, pertaining to an Israeli tax law. The M.P. Vilner made use of the name of the Communist faction to say things, that have nothing in common neither with communism nor with common sense nor with a minimal responsibility towards the life of this people, towards the existence of this people.

"M. Vilner stood up against the independence loan, stressing with irony the word "independence", because in his opinion Israel acted during the days of war in collusion with imperialism, whereas the whole world knows that the battle in the Sinai desert broke out on June 5th against the will of the U. S. State Department and others, that it was a war for survival of the people of Israel. Today M. P. Vilner is able to take the floor quietly and defy the facts, for there was a brilliant victory of the Israeli Defence Army. Woe to him too, if this Army were not victorious. If he had scrutinized the documents of the Egyptian and the Jordanian commands he would have convinced himself, what they had in store for the Jewish population, for our children, for our women, for our elders, for the whole of us".

S. Mikunis went on with much emotion :

"This speech by NCL is not all aimed at the people of Israel, because the people of Israel abhors these words. It is aimed at somebody beyond the frontiers. This is not a speech to be delivered to the Knesset (the Israeli parliament) or to the people of Israel; this is a speech to be quoted somewhere else. This is the "King's evidence" for the purpose of quotation. Woe to these crown-witnesses ! They are branded by the people, by the youth, by the survivors of the holocaust, who came here to live and to build up a peaceful existence. It is possible to equate this war with the war of 1965? There is no resemblance between these two wars in many respects. Among others the last war differs from the previous one in the following respect. It were not some youngsters, it was not some fascist like Ahmed Shukeiri, it were the presidents of Egypt, Syria and Irak and the king of Jordan, who declared unmistakably, that they are out to destroy the State of Israel. And suddenly Israel found herself encircled on all sides by alien armies. In spite of Israel's declaration of June 5th, that she would not attack Jordan and Syria, they opened fire on her and shelled Jerusalem for a whole day.

The M. P. Vilner stayed with us in the shelter when the Jordanians shelled us. Israel didn't reply for a whole day out of assumption, that Jordan only wishes to comply with Egypt. Jordan, however, was not content with complying with Egypt, but waged war on us, and it was to be a war of annihilation."

"In view of this", Comrade Mikunis went on, "the decisive matter is the political programme. No authority ruled who started the war, and besides that according to Leninism it was not important in this war - as it is not in any war - who fired the first shot, but what was the political programme of the belligerent sides. What is the political programme of the

Pan-Arab front with regards to us ? It is the destruction of Israel, the annihilation of this people, the deportation of all the Jews, who immigrated after November 2nd, 1917. And what is the political programme of Israel, of the Israeli government, to which I am opposed ? Their political programme was to secure the existence, independence and sovereignty. That was and still is a just programme. With these programmes the two sides stood up one against the other : One just side, and one unjust side - if the term "unjust" suffices to define those who are out to destroy you. That was the nature of this war : A just war, a war of existence, Israel's war for existence and independence. Therefore we concentrate on the fight for peace, for peace with the Arab countries was the basic aim of this war, a just and stable peace.

"Hence we have to insist on peace and not on "retreat" to the lines of armistice because somebody told us to retreat, and to retreat unconditionally : Maybe there is somebody who doesn't mind where I retreat to, but to us it is a question of life and death. We are opposed to territorial conquests, we are opposed to the perpetuation of territorial conquests; however we waged the war not in order to conquer territories, but because we were threatened with annihilation and it was imperative to prevent it. The people of Israel has no need whatsoever of territorial conquests. It is interested in stable peace with the Arab countries, but the rulers of these countries go on declaring - even after the military defeat - that they are opposed to peace, that they are intent to continue the policy and activity aimed at the annihilation of Israel.

"This is the way the question is to be put, and not some way else. So what is all this idle and outworn talk of NCL ? What is all this slander of Communism ? Has all this anything in common with communism ? What is this defamation of the noble ideas of socialism ? If someone slanders us - do we have to follow suit ?"

Summing up his speech the CPI representative said :

"Whoever is prepared not to be, whoever wishes to make declarations from the Mars, because somebody fights against the existence of this state and this people, is entitled to vote as he likes. This will not alter our reality. The people of Israel is united around the just aim of that war, of that military battle - the achievement of a just and stable peace between Israel and Arab countries".

A DISAPPOINTING COMMUNIQUE OF THE WORLD PEACE MOVEMENT

by Ester Vilenska, member of the Politbureau of the C. P. I. and member of the Israeli Peace Committee

During the grave crisis in the Israel-Arab relations it would have been natural that the partisans of peace in Israel and in the Arab countries should receive support from the World Peace Movement to ease tension, to show the way to prevent war and to find a peaceful solution. To our deepest regret, the Secretariat of the World Peace Council published on May 31th, 1967 a communiqué that roused objection and disappointment among Israel's peace partisans.

The fundamental error

The fundamental error of this document, published at a time when Israel-Arab tension reached its peak, is that it does not call upon the peoples of the Middle East to liquidate the dangerous conflict and to solve peacefully the continuous and ever-increasing crisis. This communiqué does not show the way how to bring about an approximation between the two parties, nor does it contain any peaceful solution.

The above document of the Secretariat of the World Peace Council describes the plans of American and British imperialism and the Israeli acts of retaliation as factors of tension, but it entirely ignores the many declarations of the rulers of the Arab countries and the leader of the "Palestine Liberation Organisation" that their aim is to liquidate the State of Israel by a "war of liberation" against the State and the people of Israel.

These repeated declarations by the President of Egypt and the President of Syria against co-existence with Israel and the infiltrations into Israel territory by the men of "Al Fattah" and other Arab terrorist organisations, the acts of sabotage, mining and murder were followed by Israeli acts of military reprisal and extraordinarily aggravated the tension in the region.

How can the Secretariat of the World Peace Movement display such an indifference with regard to the closing of the passage through the Straits of Tiran ?

Disregarding facts

The definition of the Secretariat of the World Peace Movement, asserting that "a campaign of lies relates the responsibility for the present

threat to peace to the attempts of destroying the State of Israel" and presenting these threats against the State of Israel as "transparent distortions" are incompatible with the truth and mean a contempt of the feelings and rights of the people of Israel.

We, the Israeli Communists and other peace partisans in Israel are not prepared to be satisfied with the Secretariat of the World Peace Movement's disregarding the threat against the right of the State of Israel to exist.

It is regrettable that the Peace Movement did not reach the conclusion of United Nations' Secretary U. Thant, who declared at a press conference on the 11th of May 1967 in New York, that the acts of sabotage by the terrorist organisations in Israel territory are a threat to peace and are incompatible with the armistice agreements of 1949 between Israel and her neighbours.

We believe that the World Peace Movement is not entitled to ignore the fact, that in the conflict prevailing between Israel and the Arab countries there is nobody questioning the sovereignty of Egypt, Syria or Jordan, Lebanon or Iraq, while there are people questioning publicly and permanently Israel's right to existence, although this right has been recognised by the United Nations Organisation.

An agreement between the peoples will promote their struggle
against imperialism

We do not disregard the fact, that the Palestine Arab people did not succeed in realising its right that had been recognised by the U. N. Assembly in November 1947. We, the Israeli Communists, recognise the existence of this problem, respect the rights of the Arab people and demand that the government of Israel recognise its rights and be prepared to contribute on its part to a just solution of this painful problem - within the framework of general peace settlement. The fact that the just rights of the Palestine Arab people have not yet been realised, obliges the factors concerned to work for a just, urgent and peaceful solution, but this does not allow any Middle Eastern or world factor to disregard the threat against Israel's right to existence. We firmly stand for the right of Israel to exist, not because we deny the rights of any neighbouring people, but out of respect of the just rights of the neighbouring Arab peoples.

The World Peace Movement supports the peaceful solution of international conflicts, through negotiations and agreement; therefore it is regrettable and painful that it does not apply this principle to the Israel -

Arab conflict.

The declaration of the World Peace Movement rightly points out that the armed force of the American imperialists, which are in the Middle East, thousands of miles from their homeland, are interested in fostering military tension, so as to safeguard their positions. The history of the twentieth century tells of many facts that the imperialists encouraged provocative attitudes among each of the two parties to a dispute, so as to strengthen their status. Therefore, we are still more convinced of the conclusion, that the success of the struggle for a peaceful solution of the Israel-Arab conflict will advance the independence of the peoples, peace between them, will weaken the forces of imperialism and remove them from our region.

A discussion to put the wrong right

We know well, that the birth of the Peace Movement, embracing countries of all continents, is an expression of the deep aspiration of the peoples for a world without wars. We belong to this movement since its foundation because we strive to contribute - to our best ability - to the cause of world peace and we also expect to get its support for the promotion of peace on our borders.

If we are arguing now publicly with this communiqué of the Secretariat of the World Peace Movement, we do so because we are convinced that peace partisans - even if they are wrong in this respect or another - cannot fail to arrive at an amendment of the injustice and at the conclusion that future actions must be in the spirit of co-existence between the countries of our region and a peaceful solution of the complicated and painful Israel-Arab conflict.

We expect the help of peace-loving international factors to achieve Israel-Arab talks based on justice to our people and justice to our neighbours. Although the General Secretary of NATO has declared on the 12th of June 1967 that he supports freedom of Israeli shipping, we know well that our country will not be secure by the aid of imperialistic factors which are drowning in blood the people of Vietnam and push towards a world war, but by an agreement between the great powers accompanied by talks with the peoples of Middle East - not based on conquests but on the rights of the peoples.

The contribution to be expected from the Peace Movement

We Israeli Communists are fighting for an Israeli policy of peace that is not to be based on territorial conquests, but on the right of the peoples.

We are calling for a peace to be achieved not by force of a dictate or by surrender to a dictate, but a peace based on mutual recognition and safeguarding of the rights of all peoples on both sides of the bloody conflict.

Israel needs peace and friendship of the near and distant countries. For this purpose a fundamental change in the political relation with various countries is necessary. The main object of the present political campaign must be to attain agreed arrangements which are to serve as a transition from the cease-fire between Israel and Egypt, Jordan and Syria towards permanent peace. No doubt, this will be a prolonged, complicated and hard campaign, but there are good prospects if all the parties concerned will think not only of the past but of the future, too, if they will learn a lesson from the stormy events that shook the middle East in these days, and if they will agree to a dialogue based on equality and recognition of the neighbour's right to live, without exception.

One of the results of the military campaign is the complete political and moral failure of the view-point that claimed a "solution" of the Israel-Arab conflict by means of liquidating the State of Israel and erasing it from the map of Palestine.

We are mourning the many victims who have fallen in the campaign. We are drawing a clear line of separation between the devotion of our sons in the military struggle for the existence of Israel and its rights, and the extremist Israeli groups who are striving for territorial expansion. We must not ignore the fact, that with Israel's military victory the Israel-Arab conflict has not found its solution. A peaceful settlement must take into consideration the legitimate and just rights of our people and of all the neighbouring Arab peoples. If we want to advance towards peace, we need therefore, a clever policy, refraining from any dictate and any surrender of one party to the other. Permanent peace cannot be founded on trends of territorial expansion, but on the willingness of both parties to solve all the questions on the basis of mutual respect of the just national rights of the people of Israel and of all the Arab peoples.

In this spirit, we expect the World Peace Movement to help the forces of peace in Israel and in the Arab countries to build a first bridge of brotherhood, agreement and peace.

(Published in "Kol Ha'am", 19.6.67)

Is there any connection between the H-bomb test in China and the debate opened by the United Nations on the Israel -Arab crisis ? Certainly, there is.

The Chinese leaders have been backing since a long time the Arab chauvinists who want to liquidate Israel. More than that, Chairman Mao Tse Tung urged Chairman Ahmed Shukeiry, not to delay the start of the war of "hundred million Moslems against two million Jews"... Soviet policy, on the other hand, opposed in principle the adventurous plans of Shukeiry, of his organisation and of his army for the "liberation of Palestine" by the "liquidation of Israel". However, Chinese influence was growing not only in the Al-Fattah" and the "Palestine Liberation Organisation" and not only among the ruling circles of the Baath Party in Damascus, but in the Arab national movement generally, including Cairo. No doubt, the pressure of growing Chinese influence in the pan-Arabic camp could not be ignored by Soviet policy, when it shaped its attitude towards the recent developments in Israel-Arab relations.

Despite its unreserved support of the Arab governments in their conflicts with Israel, the Soviet government was subjected to unrestrained attacks from Peking because of its participation in the "plot" with American imperialism and its tool Israel, against the Arab peoples. After the military defeat of the Arab states in their clash with the Israel Defence Army during the six days of June 1967, there appeared many public revelations of Arab disappointment of the Soviet Union because it did not extend the expected aid in the heat of the war against Israel, and simultaneously with these revelations, Chinese influence reached its peaks in the Arab countries.

Yesterday, news reports from Egypt said that "the first H-bomb tested by China gained publicity of striking headlines in the Egyptian press; this is the first time that Egyptian newspapers attribute such a great importance to the Chinese nuclear tests". These sources of information point out, that in the case that the activities of the Soviet Union and France - each in its own way - will not be successful in the United Nations Organisation, in obtaining an order for the retreat of the Israeli army to the lines of 1949, "Egypt will turn toward the only friend left to her - to China"....

Certainly, even now, when the Soviet Union has not called and acted for Israel-Arab negotiations on a mutual agreement, the Soviet leaders are condemned by Peking as partners to the "plot" with Anglo-American imperialism and its "running dog" Israel. The more so, if the Soviet Union would have acted as it did in every other similar conflict. But from the point of view of the struggle against the Chinese line, too, it seems to us that Soviet policy will be successful if it presents a line opposed to that of China, namely a line of mutual agreement towards Israel-Arab peace - and it will not compete with the Chinese line by partially adapting to this line.

We have not doubt that sooner or later the international Communist movement will agree to this our view - and the sooner the better !

We are mourning the many victims who have fallen in the campaign. We are drawing a clear line of separation between the devotion of our sons in the military struggle for the existence of Israel and its rights, and the extremist Israeli groups who are striving for territorial expansion. We must not ignore the fact, that with Israel's military victory the Israel-Arab conflict has not found its solution. A peaceful settlement must take into consideration the legitimate and just rights of our people and of all the neighbouring Arab peoples.

("Kol Ha'am" editorial, 19.6.1967)

ISM-IN-THE-20TH-CENTURY-----0172047A

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



HX 632 A1 W9 no.1104

World communism in the 20th
century.

0172047A MAIN

